

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 3-15 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the above enumerated claims are nonstatutory because a computer-readable medium, as positively recited in the pending claims, is asserted to be defined to include signals in addition to physical media. However, this assertion is incorrect. As discussed on page 43, lines 20-29 of the Applicants' disclosure, any resulting program, having computer-readable program code, may be embodied within one or more computer-usable media such as memory devices or transmitting devices, thereby making a computer program product or article of manufacture according to the invention. The computer-readable medium, therefore, is drawn to only tangible physical devices, and not signals, which the devices may nonetheless utilize in due course of operation. Additionally, the above enumerated claims were amended in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §101 in the Applicants' response, dated March 19, 2007, to the Office Action dated November 14, 2006. The response to the rejection is accepted and the rejection is withdrawn in subsequent Office Actions, dated June 7, 2007 and November 9, 2007. Therefore, as claims 1 and 3-15 recite subject matter which is statutory under 35 U.S.C. §101, as discussed above and confirmed by the above Office Actions, reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejection are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 3-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,487,566 to Sundaresan. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action asserts that Sundaresan teaches the features as positively recited in the pending claims, including wherein the second code structure comprises a plurality of filter characteristics corresponding to a plurality of possible structural forms of the first code structure. However, this assertion is incorrect. Structures, and structural forms, are defined in the Applicants' disclosure on page 1, lines 29-36, as comprising a number of different data structure types, including text, trees, and graphs. The Office Action relies on col. 6, lines 29-45, to teach the above-discussed feature. However, Sundaresan here teaches only a single structural form of text which may be filtered. Specifically, the only structural form allowed for processing in Sundaresan is text, such as, but not limited to, the XML language. Sundaresan further teaches text parsing of documents using a second text structure known as a pattern matching language, or PML. This PML text is described in col. 6, lines 46-63 of Sundaresan. Sundaresan notes that other text languages, such as HTML, SGML, Perl, C, C++, and others may be substituted for XML, in col. 12, lines 40-45. However, all of these substitutes also take the structural form of text documents. Because Sundaresan does not teach, nor would it have suggested, a plurality of structural forms, as positively recited in the pending claims, Sundaresan cannot reasonably be considered to teach, nor would it have suggested, this feature.

Additionally, in order to further clarify the above discussed feature, claim 1 is amended to positively recite the plurality of structural forms comprising text, trees, and graphs. Therefore, as Sundaresan fails to teach, nor would it have suggested, that the second code structure comprises a plurality of filter characteristics corresponding to a plurality of possible structural forms of the first code structure, a plurality of possible structural forms comprising text, trees, and graphs, Sundaresan cannot anticipate this feature.

For at least the above reasons, Sundaresan cannot reasonably be considered to teach, nor would it have suggested, the combination of features as positively recited in independent

claim 1. Claims 3-15 are also allowable at least for their dependence on allowable independent claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §101 and §102 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 3-15 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkhimer
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:ARK/cxo

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: March 20, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
